UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

IAN A. WOODS et al,

Plaintiff.

Case No.: 2:14-cv-01556-RFB-VCF

MAGISTRATE JUDGE

v.

ORDER ACCEPTING IN PART REPORT & RECOMMENDATION OF

MAXIMUS COFFEE GROUP et al,

Defendants.

Before the Court for consideration is the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 4) of the Honorable V. Cam Ferenbach, United States Magistrate Judge, entered October 7, 2014.

A district court "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). A party may file specific written objections to the findings and recommendations of a magistrate judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Local Rule IB 3-2(a). When written objections have been filed, the district court is required to "make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); see also Local Rule IB 3-2(b). Where a party fails to object, however, a district court is not required to conduct "any review," *de novo* or otherwise, of the report and recommendations of a magistrate judge. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985).

Pursuant to Local Rule IB 3-2(a), objections were due by October 24, 2014. No objections have been filed. The Plaintiffs did file an Amended Complaint on October 29, 2014.

The Court has reviewed the record in this case and concurs with the Magistrate Judge's recommendation(s). These recommendations, however, must be placed in the context of the

Case 2:14-cv-01556-RFB-VCF Document 7 Filed 01/29/15 Page 2 of 2

current record, since the Plaintiffs have filed an Amended Complaint in apparent response to the Report and Recommendation. IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 4) is **ACCEPTED** and **ADOPTED** in part. IT IS FURTHER HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiffs' first Complaint is DISMISSED. **DATED** this 29th day of January, 2015. RICHARD F. BOULWARE, II. United States District Court Judge